



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,768	07/20/2006	Andreas Meudt	2004DE302	7994
38263 7590 12/01/2009 PROPAT, L.L.C. 425-C SOUTH SHARON AMITY ROAD CHARLOTTE, NC 28211-2841				
EXAMINER MABRY, JOHN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/586,768	Applicant(s) MEUDT ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN MABRY	Art Unit 1625	

All Participants:

(1) JOHN MABRY.

(2) Cathy Moore.

Date of Interview: 11/24/2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
n/a

Claims discussed:
n/a

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 9:55 am

//John Mabry/
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
POTENTIAL ABANDONMENT FOR FAILURE TO RESPOND - A phone message was left for attorney of record, Cathy Moore. A returned call was received from office representative Claire Wygand. Examiner and Ms. Wygand discussed via telephone if Applicant sent a Response to a Final Rejection mailed on May 22, 2009. Ms. Wygand told Examiner that Applicant did not send a Response to Application 10/586,768, filed on July 20, 2006.